FILED

AUG 29 2013

CLERK U.S. DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA DEPUTY

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

KFX MEDICAL CORPORATION, a Delaware corporation,

Plaintiff,

VS.

ARTHREX INCORPORATED, a Delaware corporation,

Defendant.

CASE NO. 11cv1698 DMS (BLM)

JURY VERDICT FORM

Ladies and gentlemen of the jury, it is now your duty to answer the questions presented in this verdict form after due deliberation. Please answer the questions in the order in which they appear.

DIRECT INFRINGEMENT

1. Has KFx proven by a preponderance of the evidence that surgeons performing the **SutureBridge** technique directly infringe the following claims of the KFx patents?

		"YES" is a finding for KFx	"NO" is a finding for Arthrex
'311 Patent	Claim 1		
	Claim 20	V,	
	Claim 28		
'942 Patent	Claim 1	V	
	Claim 18		1

- 1 -

11cv1698

1			
		•	
2)		

'969 Patent	Claim 1		
	Claim 3	\checkmark	

Has KFx proven by a preponderance of the evidence that surgeons performing the 2. SpeedBridge technique directly infringe the following claims of the KFx patents?

		"YES" is a finding for KFx	"NO" is a finding for Arthrex
'311 Patent	Claim 1	V,	:
¥	Claim 20		
	Claim 28	/ ,	
'942 Patent	Claim 1		
	Claim 18		
'969 Patent	Claim 1	V,	
	Claim 3		

If you answered "NO" for every claim in questions 1 and 2, skip to question 5.

INFRINGEMENT - INDUCEMENT

If you answered "YES" for any claim in question 1, has KFx proven by a preponderance of the 3. evidence that Arthrex has induced infringement of that claim by the SutureBridge technique?

		"YES" is a finding for KFx	"NO" is a finding for Arthrex
'311 Patent	Claim 1	V	
	Claim 20		
	Claim 28		
'942 Patent	Claim 1		·
	Claim 18	V.	
'969 Patent	Claim 1		
	Claim 3		

If you answered "YES" for any claim in question 2, has KFx proven by a preponderance of the evidence that Arthrex has induced infringement of that claim by the SpeedBridge technique?

		"YES" is a finding for KFx	"NO" is a finding for Arthrex
'311 Patent	Claim 1		

	1
	2
	3
	4
٠	5
	6
	7
	8
	9
1	0
1	1
1	2
1	3

	Claim 20	//	
	Claim 28	/	
'942 Patent	Claim 1	V ,	
	Claim 18	//	
'969 Patent	Claim 1		.*
	Claim 3	V	

VALIDITY - ANTICIPATION

5. Has Arthrex proven by clear and convincing evidence that the following claims of the KFx patents are anticipated by a single prior art reference?

		"YES" is a finding for Arthrex	"NO" is a finding for KFx
'311 Patent	Claim 1		
	Claim 20		V ,
	Claim 28		
'942 Patent	Claim 1		
	Claim 18		٧,
'969 Patent	Claim 1		
	Claim 3		V

VALIDITY - OBVIOUSNESS

6. Has Arthrex proven by clear and convincing evidence that the following claims of the KFx patents would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the claimed invention was made?

	·	"YES" is a finding for Arthrex	"NO" is a finding for KFx
'311 Patent	Claim 1		
	Claim 20		V /
	Claim 28	i i	
'942 Patent	Claim 1		/ /
	Claim 18		
'969 Patent	Claim 1		

(Claim 3			· .		<u> </u>		$\sqrt{}$	
		WIL	LFULNE	ESS					•
If you ansv	vered "YES"	' for any claim	in questi	ons 3	or 4, a	and "l	NO" fo	r the	corre
aim in question	5 through 6	, has KFx pro	ven by cle	ear an	d con	vincir	ng evid	lence 1	that A
fringement was v									
	"VEC" in	a finding for K	Tru	7.1	'NIO"	ia o fi	nding	for Ar	thrav
311 Patent	I ES IS	a finding for K	T.X		NO	15 4, 11	numg	IOI AI	шсх
942 Patent					Tr.				
969 Patent						•			·
- ا ه	a = 1	<u>v</u>		Λ		n			,
ATED: $8/2$	9/201	<u> </u>	Ea	repers	or G	rh	. 2	Car	ly
			ro.	· reberg					U
	*	62 -							
				•	,		?		
	•.								
					• • •	:			
		•						,	
					•				
	· · · • ·								
v				**		•	ŧ		•
		e de la companya de l							
		. "			; ;				
						w			,
		,							
	,	,							
,									

Case 3:11-cv-01698-DMS-BLM Document 256 Filed 08/29/13 Page 4 of 4